

Meeting Notes
FEJF 308/309 Smoke Management Program workshop
June 16-17

Attendance:

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Lisa Riener	Quinault Nation	Paul Schlobohm	BLM
Cathy Messerschmitt	NTEC-TCC	Sue Ferguson	USFS/PNW
Lee Alter	WGA/WRAP	Renee Shealy	SCDHEC-Air/Vistas
Ron Heavner	ESDA/NRCS	Bob Lebens	WESTAR
Phill Harwell	TX CEQ	Bob Gruenig	NTEC
Sarah Rees	Washington DOE	Pat Cummins	WGA/WRAP
Rick Stender	Washington DOE	Dave Strohm	UT DEQ
Ron Sherron	BIA	Rita Trujillo	New Mexico AQB
Darrel Johnston	Washington DNR	Lisa Bye	BLM/FWS/NPS/NM
Steve Body	EPA R10	Sam Jackson	Nevada BAQP
Brian Finneran	Oregon DEQ	Coleen Campbell	Colorado APCD
Megan Schuster	MANE-VU	Mike Ziolko	OR DOF
Mark Fitch	AZ DEQ	Suraj Ahuja	USFS
Pete Lahm	USFS	Bob Palzer	Sierra Club
Darla Potter	Wy DEQ-AQD	Don Arkell	WESTAR
Melanie Lombardo	AK DEC	Brian Mitchell	NPS
Ron Klein	AK DEC	Debra Wolfe	MT DEQ
Jim Russell	USFS/BLM - Portland	Bob Habeck	MT DEQ
Brian Bischof	USFS R2/R4	Diane Riley	ID DEQ
Neva Sotolongo	CA/ARB	Mike Edwards	Idaho DEQ
Dave Randall	Air Sciences Inc	Peter Murchie	USEPA OAQPS
John Kennedy (ph)	EPA R9	Tom Webb (ph)	EPA R9
Tina Suarez-	CA/ARB	Angel McCormack	Nez Perce Tribe
Murias(ph)		Matthew Heverly	Met One Inst.

Presentation: FEJF Policies and Guidance- Pete Lahm

(See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Background on FEJF, including forum organization, process.

2. Status of FEJF Work products, with explanation of each work product as it addresses it corresponding RH requirement. Presented in three categories:

Policy documents adopted by the WRAP board as recommendations to meet the requirements of the RH Rule for fire:

- ESMP
- Fire Categorization
- Annual Emission Goals

Fire Tracking Systems

Guidance and Reference documents adopted by the WRAP for use by states and tribes to develop and implement smoke management programs:

- Alternatives to burning on wildland
- Alternatives to burning on agricultural land
- Assessment of Smoke in planning
- Emission Reduction Techniques
- Elements of Basic Smoke Management
- FEJF Flyer and FEJF storyline for outreach
- Smoke Management Plan Surveys

Technical Support documents included in the 309 SIP submittals:

- 1996 EIs for Prescribed fire, wildfire/prescribed fire
- 2018 projected EIs for prescribed fire, wildfire and agricultural prescribed burning

Correlation of each major 309 and 308 fire requirement with a corresponding FEJF project (See Presentation, final four slides)

The work completed to date by the FEJF has applicability for both 309 as well as 308 states and tribes.

Moderated session: Experience of 309 States Incorporating and Implementing Smoke Management in SIPs.

Arizona-Corky Martinkovic (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Emphasis on what 309 requirements are, what AZ had in place already its authority to do a plan, the approach taken to develop the AZ SIP, what needs to be done for 309(g) and 308R.
2. Extensive stakeholder process already in place
3. Had to obtain additional legal authority for regional planning
4. Considers 309(g)=308.

Oregon-Brian Finneran (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Emphasis on including only large fires in the smoke management program. Oregon is in the Clean Air Corridor for the Colorado Plateau Class I areas.
2. Most Rx burning in OR and Ag burning in the Willamette Valley were addressed in the 309 SIP.
3. Already had "advanced" smoke management programs.
4. Biggest issue was AEG, alternatives to burning. Still need to work on implementation of these. Will submit supplement later this year.
5. Private rangeland burning is an issue that will need to be addressed as well as the state statute exempting ag burning, except for in the Willamette valley.

New Mexico-Rita Trujillo

1. Unlike some other states New Mexico has authority to regulate agricultural burning.
2. Classifies all burning above a de minimus into two SMP levels, based on emission threshold. Emissions threshold estimated by WAG. Burning below SMP de minimus is under separate open burning rule-not part of RHSIP.
3. Diverse stakeholder group. Lengthy stakeholder process
4. On track to address Annual Emission Goal requirement, admin. barriers to Alt
5. Estimate 1 FTE to run program + BLM assistant

EPA Perspective, phone discussion-John Kennedy, Tom Webb

General Comments on EPA thinking at this point re: the 309 SIPs. EPA still needs to brief management, so no specifics

Big Picture:

1. Great progress on SMP development in 309 states-either with new programs or improved existing programs. Level of technical understanding of fire and smoke dispersion has greatly improved.
2. FEJF collaborative process is a big factor in making progress in improving SMPs
3. Big improvements have been made in understanding emissions and dispersion of smoke from fire.

309 SIPs:

1. EPA is in process of review, with a regional team of EPA experts, but with each region doing its own thing with respective states.
2. The regions may be positioned to brief management in a couple of months.

Some of the strengths and weaknesses of 309 process.

1. Forum developed products to address each of the regulatory requirements, but some of these products didn't always show up in SIPs.

Example: RH rule is explicit regarding administrative barriers, but several SIPs only gave a commitment to a process, with no timetable, etc.

Example: EPA position that AEG needs to be in context of a total emissions inventory, not just emissions averted. Fire tracking system should help produce actual inventories. Some states are doing this. Regional emissions tracking system, EDMS should enable states to move toward annual fire EIs.

2. STIP II wasn't followed in several cases. EPA expectation was that SIPs would be more identical, allowing EPA to "pro-forma" approval.
3. EPA is looking at "vulnerabilities" as reviews proceed

308 Submittals-Future EPA role; lessons learned:

1. If EPA continues to be involved in advisory capacity, it needs to be more explicit in its guidance.
2. A 308 "STIP II" or something like it should be done earlier.
3. For the future, Process is beneficial and should continue,

Discussion:

1. Final EPA rulemakings on 309 SIPs are scheduled June 2005. These rulemakings are not subject to OMB review. Completeness determinations are due June, 2004. If no action by EPA, SIPs are deemed complete by rule of law.

2. Different regions will deal individually with their respective states. EPA will try to signal deficiencies (cleanup) without having to go through rulemaking earlier. Feasible fixes should be done before EPA rulemaking.
3. WRAP workload implications? Tom will address at the July Planning Team meeting.
4. What if state agency tries and fails to get legal authority to include ag in smoke management? Don't know.
5. Do local authorities qualify under the "enforceability" requirement? Does 308 allow local implementation? Need interpretation
6. Can something be substituted in place of agricultural burning (Ag is called out explicitly in RH rule)? Maybe, but at least do analysis with quantification evaluation that is reasonable, maybe establish de minimus levels.
7. FLMs may have some concern about equity with establishing de minimus, as they are required to meet the same requirements, and would expect the same treatment. However smaller sources could become a more important part of the picture as larger sources are controlled.
8. Guidance schedule? Don't know, but will find out.
9. This is an iterative process, needs to be defensible.
10. EPA has no sanction "hammer" to force corrections, as there is for NAAQS.

What 309 states still need for fire:

Oregon needs some internal work. Oregon has an EI. Would use the fire tracking system through the WRAP

New Mexico-Need evaluation of other Class I areas (WRAP) to meet 309(g), NM will continue with 309 ESMP for other Class I areas and is not likely to add elements, except as indicated through improved data. Better dispersion systems would be helpful.

AZ same thing, internal for now for other CIAs

UT same thing, Could use ERT calculations

WY stress Regional coordination. Need EDMS/FTS, ERT calculations,

WRAP FEJF is working on fire tracking, emission inventories, ERT calculations, and regional coordination.

CA-Local districts/land managers' agreement. Look on CARB website, "Wildland Fire Use Coordination and Communication Protocol"

June 17, 2004

308 state perspective

Montana-Bob Habeck (See presentation at: <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Montana has sophisticated SMP-Goals of the program are effectiveness, equity, simplicity, and to accommodate prescribed burning to the greatest extent within the regulatory limits. MT approach is a phased strategy
2. Stepwise process, starting with data (Attribution of Haze), who within MT is contributing, calculate base-year emissions from burning. Strategies in the SIP will vary for each Class I area, depending on its individual factors.
3. MT will use FEJF products, including ERTs, Fire Classification, Fire Tracking System.
4. Comments include: Flexibility in defining Permanent and Enforceable; Account for the extreme spatial and temporal variability of fire by season; Some smaller activities are difficult to address due to political or practical factors. MT believes emission caps provide more certainty as AEG than emissions averted through ERTs.

Alaska-Melanie Lombardo (See presentation at: <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. By far, most wildland fire in AK is wildfire-may be close to natural fire regimes. Fire suppression in AK has been policy for a relatively short period of time.
2. Whatever smoke management efforts occur are likely to be in areas where there has been suppression.
4. Suppression may be more harmful than wildfire.
3. The AK SMP is designed to ensure smoke from Rx burning activities is minimized
4. AK needs the technical work products from FEJF, including fuel models and mapping, Fire Tracking System. Remote sensing is valuable, especially to estimate trans-oceanic transport.

Nevada-Sam Jackson (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Uses elements of EPA Interim Policy on Wildland and Rx Fire as framework for existing SMP
2. The NV SMP excludes major populated counties, Clark and Washoe handle their own smoke management policies, and will likely submit their own local RH plans.
3. There are mechanisms in place to address each element of Interim Policy
4. Although participation in SMP is voluntary, there is good cooperation from FLMs via MOUs; Ag burning is exempted from all burning rules. Not much Ag data.
5. NV needs the Attribution of Haze Report to help determine if in-state burning impacts visibility in the only Class I area of the state.
6. NV needs fire emissions data

Tribal-Lisa Riener, Quinault Nation

1. The Quinault Nation includes large areas of heavy timber with lots of debris.
2. Open burning program is tabled, by the tribal council but there is active participation anyway, including preauthorization and compliance with daily go-no-go determinations.

3. Monitoring now on Tahola, including nephelometer
5. Working now on biomass-fueled power plant.

Tribal-Angel McCormack, Nez Perce

1. Now contracting out forecasting
2. There is a coordinated SMP in northern ID. Need better coordination between forest and agricultural burning activities.
3. MOUs with EPA and ID for parallel programs on the reservation
4. There is a significant amount of voluntary coordination with other tribes.

General Discussion-

Tribes' needs in general are pretty basic. There are many overlapping challenges facing tribes that are not easy to determine by others. A collaborative approach is essential to identify and resolve them.

Idaho believes use of alternatives to burning should be tracked, and there is a need for real-time wildfire tracking, including WFU.

Bob Palzer concurs about tracking use of alternatives as the best way to reduce emissions, rather than trying to 'manage' smoke, once it is emitted.

Land manager Perspective-

Pete Lahm, USFS-Recap of 309 and recommendations for 308 (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

This is a composite view from several FLMs, + private land owners
Review of 309 process (partial list)

1. FLMs have national mandate for fuels management
2. Concerns about equity for all fire sources, including Ag
3. Stakeholder/collaborative process was in general, very positive

Recommendations for 308 process (partial list)

1. Keep broad stakeholder process
2. Maintain early FLM involvement
3. Concern that "fixed cap" approach to AEGs may affect FLM fuels management programs
4. FLMs are willing partners in managing the SMP implementation
5. Utilize EPA Interim Guidance principles
6. Understand FLM planning processes, and encourage air agencies to review and assess plans for air quality impacts.

-Paul Schlobohm, BLM- Fire/Air Issues Coordination Group (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

This is an interagency federal and state organization, for the purpose of coordinating federal agencies on key fire/air issues. It is a Department-level effort. State foresters also are part of this group.

Priority Issues identified (12 all together-this is a partial list):

1. Consistent guidance for burn planning and operation
2. Interagency strategy coordination on air issues
3. Consistent tracking system among the agencies to support EI
4. Coordination with other federal, state, tribal, regional agencies, including state air agencies (Note, the FLM/air agency coordination issues often come up at the local level, due in part to variation among states)
5. Facilitation of resolution of air/fire legal questions
6. Consistent public information on benefits of trade-off between wildfire and Rx burning.

Discussion of reconciling the conflicting interests, (air quality and public health, as well as forest health) finding ways to get a balance and a way through the system.

-Brian Mitchell, NPS- Legal issues for 308 process (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

FLMs are seeking legal opinions on issues relative to fire and air quality, involving interpretations of Section 7418(a) of the CAAA. These issues are about sovereign immunity. The purpose is to firm up the basis for state/federal regulatory relationships. Examples of issues (partial list):

1. Feds pay fees and fines to states?
2. Go-no-go decisions by states apply to FLM?
3. Nuisance citations?
4. Several equity issues about uneven applicability of rules for forest/range management and agricultural operations

Discussion-

Concern that these inquiries undermine the collaborative atmosphere. Similar issues have caused disputes about respective authorities in some areas

-Scott Kuehn, Plum Creek Timber, MT-Private landholders' representative (by phone)

1. Private land managers burn for economic reasons, such as habitat,
2. Burning is done very carefully
3. At some point, some in the industry would like more burning restrictions
4. Scott's view is that forest products industry can live with everything FEJF has come up with so far.

Fire Emission Inventories-Tom Moore and Dave Randall
(See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

Summary of status of 2002 fire emission inventory project. Phase I 2002 EI is completed, with maps, tables.

1. Phase II will be a QC, with states reviewing data and making revisions as appropriate.

2. Some general conclusions can be derived for Phase I. For example:
 - Throughout the west, including AK, 90% of the mass of emissions are from wildfire. It is mostly in the summer.
 - Most of the wildfire mass is in the larger fires. (de minimus implications)
 - 97% of the small fires are put out.
3. Phase II should be completed by September

Some planning issues for fire- Lee Alter (See presentation at: <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. How do we show Reasonable Progress for fire, given the variability of wildfire? Several options were identified.
2. What is a planning year? Major variability, temporally and spatially. Extreme events should be factored in, even as one seeks a “typical” burning profile.
3. When are the smoke impacts, relative to 20% worst and 20% best days?
4. Purpose of a planning inventory is to provide a representative base case to gauge the effect a control strategy may have. How do we do this? Some options:
 - Average year-Average tonnage spread evenly across the forested areas and smoothed over the applicable time period. It is straightforward, but avoiding the extremes may create issues;
 - Synthetic year or years – same as above, but randomize the distribution. More modeling involved;
 - Multiple actual years – Choose three years. Uses real data, require more modeling. Use actual met years. Lots more work.

Discussion about how various options compare with on-ground practices.

Fire Activity Tracking and Inter-RPO Coordination—

Aaron Worstell (See presentation at: <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Several data systems to for tracking fire on federal lands, somewhat redundant. GIS
2. Maybe new system-Hopefully to standardize EI databases.
3. Existing systems cover many of the same elements, e.g. cover type, fuel burned, acres burned, etc.
4. RPOs are not using same approaches and are at different stages in developing their fire EIs:

CENRAP-

- Uses prescribed fire-federal land use FLM databases
- State, Tribal and Private-state databases
- FOFEM to identify cover types
- Wildfire-Inter RPO

MANE-VU-

- Open burning mostly
- Contract with Pechan to develop EI for fire

MWRPO-

- Rx- Federal incident
- Wildfire Same approach as for Rx

Other
VISTAS

Uses USFS prescribed burning data Rx
Uses 1999 NEI to backfill where needed

Inter-RPO wildfire project - Pete Lahm (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

Regional Coordination Element of ESMPs

Discussed AQ community needs for 309 coordination-elements of a fire occurrence reporting system for use now, expanded later

1. Accurate data on ground cover-substitute where data is missing
2. Possible use of EDMS
3. General discussion of current coordination efforts-how to look at what others are doing, significant issues and questions related to interagency coordination .
 - Northwest states and tribes working on merging of Blue Sky/Rains to get a total picture of PM2.5 levels in Columbia River Basin. Need to incorporate Ag, from all sources; Need to tabulate graphical data to validate, have greater confidence in displayed information.
 - This is good step for data sharing, but still need to coordinate the management of burning activities. This would require an integrated display of all Class I areas throughout the region, not just state-by-state.
 - Management decisions could be made to protect 'clustered' Class I areas (Pods). Concern about ability of a single jurisdiction making decisions if there are conflicting impacts in more than one "pod"-Should one Class I area or pod be favored over any other? Who would make the call?
 - Coordination occurs at several different tiers-from planning (3 years prior to on-ground operations) to the after-activity reporting
 - Is "Interstate permitting" possible?
 - The purpose of coordination is to help managers avoid making smoke management decisions that would cause or exacerbate conditions the SMP is designed to avoid.
 - Wildfire information should also be factored into the database.
 - In some cases a jurisdiction may make decision to accommodate needs of other jurisdictions.
 - At the planning level, each jurisdiction should be sharing information.
 - Some day-to-day coordination at the operational level is done through regular conference calling (NIFC), briefings and website postings.
 - EDMS as a tool for real-time? Need information all in one place, and EDMS focus is doing this. Could start simply. Some activity now-grow the system later, as needed.
 - Different tools, that may or may not be integrated.
4. Many different ideas. Need a workshop on this topic.

FEJF workplan review-

Review of FEJF workplan (See presentation at <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Distinguish EIs for wildfire and prescribed fire in CERR
2. Watch for cost-sharing opportunities between two or more forums
3. Might be easier to see how projects match up with needs if they were grouped into broad categories, such as Inventory, Tracking, Policy refinement

Coordination and Communication Discussion-

Don Arkell (See presentations at: <http://www.wrapair.org/>)

1. Three phases of coordination and communication:
 - Inter-forum communication as WRAP work products are developed, including ongoing review by end-users, states and tribes;
 - Input and feedback to SIP/TIP processes within each state and tribe, including that from other jurisdictions;
 - Implementation, such as with 309 now, and 308 in the near future (See issues raised in section above.
2. Ways to improve coordination and communication during 308 process:
 - Implementation Work Group has a key coordination role;
 - Communications need to be streamlined within WRAP-it should not be solely up to forum co-chairs to communicate;
 - Forum participants should ensure other staff members within their agencies are up-to-date, such as planners, EI and SMP specialists, permits, compliance, etc;
 - State and tribal staff may wear several hats. Level of crossover participation within WRAP forums is a large factor in facilitating intra-staff communications;
 - The FEJF website (as well as others) is the primary source of information. A large e-mailing list is used to notice new postings. Caveat: Some interested parties do not have ready access to Internet.
 - IOC and TOC attendance at FEJF meetings would be helpful to facilitate communications.
3. Considerations during SIP/TIP development by states and tribes:
 - Don't forget private landowners as stakeholders;
 - Make SIPs/TIPs belong to respective states and tribes, not to WRAP;
 - Broad stakeholder involvement in the development of control strategies provide sense of control and ownership-more support
 - WRAP role can vary according to state and tribe acceptance of "technical support". In some cases WRAP should not be a part of the SIP/TIP development process
4. Considerations during implementation
 - May consider a 308 coordinating committee, as with 309
 - If so, could consider merging into a single coordinating group

What FEJF should do to support states and tribes

For 309, see presentations from prior day session

For 308, see presentations from prior day session

Montana

1. ERT credit calculations, for emissions goals, although MT views caps as the more permanent and enforceable;
2. Fire regime maps
3. Fire Tracking, including international (Canadian) activity

Alaska

1. Fuel models and mapping to support EI;
2. Fire tracking including wildfire which is the most predominant category;
3. Encourage remote sensing as a tracking tool
4. Transcontinental intrusions, especially from Asia

Nevada

1. Fire tracking
2. Modeling to show impacts of fire in Class I areas

Tribes

1. Facilitation of sub-regional collaborative efforts

Idaho

1. Tracking Alternatives to burning
2. Real-time wildfire and WFU activity tracking

END